

will ensure our continued superiority in the 21st century.

In addition to the combat awards I mentioned earlier, General Schnelzer has received other numerous awards and decorations, including the Defense Distinguished Service Medal, the Distinguished Service Medal, the Defense Superior Service Medal, the Meritorious Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters, the Republic of Vietnam Gallantry Cross with Palm, and the Republic of Vietnam Campaign Medal.

General Schnelzer plans to answer a higher calling and will be working for the Episcopalian Bishop in San Antonio. There, he will be coordinating the activities of all the Episcopalian churches in south Texas. On behalf of my colleagues and the congressional staff who have known and worked with General Schnelzer we wish him and his wife Helen the very best in their future endeavors.

AMERICA'S ROLE IN THE WORLD

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, many Americans remember Bruce Laingen as the able diplomat who acted with superb professionalism while being held hostage in Iran more than 15 years ago. Now Ambassador Laingen continues to serve American interests as president of the American Academy of Diplomacy. In response to the foreign policy debate now underway, the academy has adopted a very brief but important statement on America's role in the world, and I commend it to my colleagues. Much has been written and said recently about what I consider a false debate: Whether we should pursue our foreign policy unilaterally, or through multilateral institutions. Obviously, we will want to do both, depending on the circumstances. I ask that the academy's statement be printed in the RECORD.

AMERICA'S ROLE ABROAD

Most Americans accept the need for the United States to remain engaged in the world. And most will agree that clearly defined national interest should guide that engagement. But many are finding it difficult in this complex post-cold war world to reach consensus on what engagement means and where the national interest lies.

In the current debate over these issues we sense a tendency among some to equate a pragmatic pursuit of vital interests with unilateralism—arguing that international engagement must be a one-way street and that our interests are best served when the US dictates the terms or acts alone whenever it chooses. This appeal of unilateralism doubtless arises from varied impulses, one of which could be the disappointments we have encountered from the shortcomings of the United Nations.

But in a world of instant communications, globally linked financial markets, easy migration of devastating diseases and impoverished peoples, threats to the earth's oceans and atmosphere, terrorist networks operating without heed to frontiers, it is inconceivable that the United States could go it alone successfully. When nuclear weapons can be delivered by missile, ship, or in the baggage of a terrorist the necessity for active international collaboration is self-evident.

The United States can and will do some things alone. Recent negotiations with China

over protection of cultural and artistic properties and their direct relevance for jobs at home serve the point. But similar success with more intricate and strategic issues—extending the Non-Proliferation Treaty against nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction—plainly demands engagement with others. It is illusory to think that the nation's needs are so limited that they can be served without a high degree of planning and effort with other nations, including at the UN—the example of the Gulf War surely not forgotten.

No country has so large a stake in the effective functioning of such institutions as the IMF and World Bank and in the evolution of the new World Trade Organization. Development of export markets and investment opportunities is vital to our general prosperity. But these require a framework of international rules and cooperative action—as for that matter does coping with volatility in international currencies and any threat to the stability of our financial system. In today's world we have no monopoly on new technologies, nor on competition in the burgeoning global marketplace. The fact is that to a greater degree than ever before the economic well-being of virtually every American is affected by what happens outside our borders.

Finally, it should be clear that unilateralism today, like isolationism in the past, would risk nullifying American leadership in the world. With the cold war at an end, our allies and friends are no longer automatically responsive to our judgments on security concerns. Nor are we able or ready unilaterally to devote massive financial resources to the solution of international economic issues. Effective leadership, therefore, cannot be dictated by the United States; it depends on recognition by others that we share security and economic interests in common.

To protect and advance our own national interests as we go forward will require careful articulation of those interests, their alignment where possible with those of others, and a commitment to lead cooperative efforts. To do otherwise would invite forms of international anarchy both dangerous and costly to our own national interests.

TRIBUTE TO SAN ANTONIO'S EAST CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL

HON. FRANK TEJEDA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1995

Mr. TEJEDA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding achievement of the boy's basketball team of East Central High School in San Antonio, TX. This remarkable team capped a 35-win, undefeated season by winning the university interscholastic league's 5A State basketball championship on March 11, 1995. The East Central Hornets were the only undefeated team in the league this year, and the first undefeated 5a champion since 1987. As a testament to its basketball prowess, East Central was ranked as the No. 1 boy's basketball team in Texas for the entire season.

The Team included Stanley Bonewitz, Donte Mathis, Charles Jackson, Chip Moxley, David White, Keith Rice, Oliver House, Josh Barnes, Blake Sims, Eric Luke, Stacey Dubley, Ben Lakey, Jeremy Lear, Steve Shrum, Curtis Lundy, Marqueth Braziel, Jason Minica, and Matt Divin. Three Players averaged over 20

points per game for the season, and all 3 have scored over 1,000 career points. Stanley Bonewitz averaged 31.1 ppg, Donte Mathis averaged 21.3 ppg, and Charles Jackson averaged 21.1 ppg.

The Hornets averaged over 109 points per game during the regular season, and set a State tournament record for a 2-game series with 215 points. The 108 to 86 victory in the final tied the State record for most points in a championship game. Most valuable player honors for the 5A state tournament went to east Central's Stanley Bonewitz, who scored 42 points in a 107-94 semifinal win and 36 points in the final game. His 78 total points set a 5A record.

Under the direction of coach Stan Bonewitz for the past 14 years, East Central has gone 343-120 and captured 10 district championships, 7 area championships, 3 regional championships, and 1 state championship. Assistant coaches Jay Mead, Matt Oden, Steve Ochoa, and head trainer Charlie Trevino also played a key role in the team's success. Here is an example of teamwork at its best, with our young people coming together to play hard and strive for success. This year, for the Hornets, that effort garnered the state trophy. I have no doubt that the positive experiences from this past season will yield continued success both on and off the court to the East Central players and coaches.

ARROGANCE OF POWER

HON. BOB LIVINGSTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1995

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, attached are copies of correspondence received by me from the Honorable Fred J. Cassibry, U.S. district judge, retired, and now a member of the Louisiana Economic Development and Gaming Corp. Judge Cassibry, a Democrat appointee to the bench, was an outstanding jurist throughout his 20 years on the bench. He is a superlative human being, and he has documented some truly outrageous conduct by representatives of the U.S. Justice Department. His concerns should be immediately addressed by the Judiciary Committee.

LOUISIANA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

AND GAMING CORPORATION,

New Orleans, LA, March 31, 1995.

Hon. BOB LIVINGSTON,
House of Representatives,
Rayburn Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LIVINGSTON: I serve as a member of the Louisiana Economic Development & Gaming Corporation [LEDGC] and I previously served as a United States District Judge in the Eastern District of Louisiana for twenty years. I write to you regarding arrogance of power. In a flagrant and shameless abuse of the authority entrusted to it by the American people the United States Attorney's Office in New Orleans has sought to interject itself into the functions of LEDGC. The conduct was so egregious and obvious that two of Louisiana's largest newspapers editorialized against what was taking place.

By way of explanation I enclose copies of those editorials together with a copy of my letter to Attorney General Janet Reno. When she did not see fit to intervene as requested I then wrote a letter of complaint to

the Office of Professional Responsibility for the United States Department of Justice which is charged with investigating such matters. I enclose copies of those letters. It has now been five weeks since my original request for investigation and three weeks since my follow-up letter. I have received absolutely no reply or response on any kind.

Thousands of years ago the philosopher Plato in commenting on the nature of government asked the question, "Who guards the guardians?" That question is as pertinent today as ever. Society gives tremendous power to the United States Department of Justice, a power which has great potential for abuse. The only recourse given to citizens to check that abuse is that the Department supposedly has an Office of Professional Responsibility to investigate complaints. I find it astounding that when I, as a member of a state board, supported by editorials in two highly respected newspapers, make a formal complaint about Justice Department misconduct to the very office that is charged with investigating such complaints I cannot even get the courtesy of a response.

Hence, I call upon you as an elected representative of the people of Louisiana for assistance. The facts of the case clearly support the allegations of abuse of power which I have made and I would hope that the Congress would see fit to conduct its own investigation into the tactics of the Justice Department. At very least I request you help in requiring the Justice Department to investigate itself.

Awaiting your reply, I remain,

Very truly yours,

FRED J. CASSIBRY,
United States District Judge, (Ret.)
Board Member, LEDGC.

LOUISIANA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
AND GAMING CORPORATION,
New Orleans, LA, March 9, 1995.

Mr. MICHAEL SHAHEEN,
Department of Justice, Office of Professional Responsibility, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SHAHEEN: Your attention is called to my previous letter of February 8, 1995, in which I requested an investigation regarding the actions of certain members of the United States Attorney's Office in the Eastern District of Louisiana. To date I have received no response. However, I did receive correspondence from the Deputy Assistant Attorney General in the Criminal Division, a copy of which is enclosed.

As you can see from the copies of correspondence I previously sent to you, specifically my letter of January 30, 1995 to Attorney General Reno and Assistant Attorney General Harris, I had requested their intervention to secure a postponement of the scheduled grand jury appearances for myself and other members of the Louisiana Economic Development and Gaming Corporation (LEDGC). They did not fit to grant that request. I therefore wrote to you requesting an investigation as to what had transpired.

It is my understanding that you are charged with the responsibility of investigating allegations of impropriety by members of the United States Department of Justice. I renew my request that you do so. While Mr. Keenan offers his unsolicited opinion that the Assistant United States Attorneys in question acted professionally, it is my understanding that it is your function, not his, to make such determinations.

I respectfully suggest to you that it simply does not suffice to respond to citizens' complaints, as did Mr. Keenan, by stating that criminal investigations are secret and therefore the actions of the investigators cannot be discussed. I assume that all criminal investigations by the Department of Justice are confidential. If that were reason enough to

foreclose citizen inquiries and complaints there would be no need for your office to exist. The proceedings in question are not confidential as to you and members of your staff. I do not question the underlying right of the United States Attorney's Office to conduct any investigation it deems appropriate. However, you will recognize that it is possible to conduct legitimate investigations employing improper methods for ulterior motives. The letter sent by the United States Attorney's Office—signed by three assistant United States attorneys—to Bally's attorney and the timing of the subpoenas to the members of the Casino Board, constituted flagrant abuses of prosecutorial power.

I would appreciate receiving a response from you. If your office is going to investigate my complaints I would like confirmation of that. If you are declining to do so I would at least like a definitive statement from you to that effect so that I can determine what further action I should take.

Awaiting your reply, I remain,

Very truly yours,

FRED J. CASSIBRY,
United States District Judge, (Ret.)
Board Member, LEDGC.

LOUISIANA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
AND GAMING CORPORATION,
New Orleans, LA, January 31, 1995.

Hon. JANET RENO,
Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR GENERAL RENO: Following up my correspondence to you of January 30, 1995, enclosed you will find an editorial that appeared in the Baton Rouge Morning Advocate, one of the leading newspapers in our state. I again request your prompt response to my request. Since I will be at the federal grand jury you can get a message to me by calling the Attorney Conference Center at the federal court at (504) 589-6111.

Thanking you for your prompt attention to this matter and awaiting your reply, I remain,

Very truly yours,

FRED J. CASSIBRY,
United States District Judge, (Ret.)
Board members, LEDGC.

LOUISIANA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
AND GAMING CORPORATION,
New Orleans, LA, January 30, 1995.

Hon. JANET RENO,
Department of Justice, Washington, DC.

DEAR GENERAL RENO: I address this letter to you because I have been advised that the United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Louisiana, Mr. Eddie Jordan, has recused himself in the matter about which I am requesting assistance. I have been further informed that in light of Mr. Jordan's recusal all decisions in the matter have been referred to First Assistant United States Attorney Jim Letten. Since it is the conduct of Mr. Letten, in part, about which I complain I am required to write to you directly. Because this matter relates to a criminal investigation being conducted by the United States Attorney's office I am also sending a copy of this letter to the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Criminal Division, Ms. Joann Harris.

By way of background, I am a retired United States District Judge having served over twenty years in the Eastern District of Louisiana. A little over a month ago I was asked by the Governor of the State to serve on the Louisiana Economic Development and Gaming Corporation (LEDGC) which regulates the landbased casino in New Orleans. The Harrah's Corporation has been awarded the contract to run the casino and the Board is presently in the process of evaluating an application by Bally Gaming, Inc. to be the

supplier of slot machines and other gaming devices to be used in the casino.

The President of LEDGC, Mr. Wilmore Whitmore, declined Bally's application based upon its poor performance in monitoring the sale of its video poker machines in the State of Louisiana. A copy of the President's ruling is attached for your ready reference. A memorandum supporting his decision is also enclosed. Under the laws of our state Bally has the right to appeal the President's decision to the full Board.

As an individual member of the Board I was predisposed to support the President's decision. The United States Attorney's office for the Eastern District of Louisiana had indicted seventeen (17) persons that it alleged had ties with organized crime, specifically the Genovese LCN family in New York, who were distributing Bally video poker machines in Louisiana. Bally Gaming had loaned in excess of \$25 million dollars to these individuals who in turn were skimming the profits off the machines, thereby defrauding Bally and the State of Louisiana. The companies through which they were operating, Worldwide Gaming of Louisiana (WGC) and Louisiana Route Operators (LRO), went into bankruptcy. The President of Bally Gaming, Inc. Mr. Alan Maiss pleaded guilty to a felony arising out of these transactions. Our regulations require that a company seeking to do business with the casino prove by clear and convincing evidence a record of prior reliability. I certainly could understand the President's decision that Bally Gaming, Inc. did not satisfy that burden of proof.

The attorneys for Bally had no credible rebuttal to the President's decision and to the contrary expressed an inability to even discuss the allegations because of the pending federal prosecution. The primary argument submitted by Bally's attorneys to the President was that the United States Attorney's Office felt that Bally's had been a "victim" and therefore was not a knowing party to what had taken place. The President in arriving at his decision never questioned whether Bally was a victim, but correctly pointed out that it had at best been extremely negligent in allowing itself to have become partners with alleged organized crime figures and clearly did not qualify under the suitability requirements of Louisiana law.

I was shocked and dismayed to find the attorneys for Bally introducing into the record of our proceedings a letter signed by three Assistant United States attorneys expressing concern regarding the President's findings and support for Bally Gaming, Inc. A copy of that letter is attached for your ready reference. In my 20 years as a federal judge I have never seen the Department of Justice interject itself in such a flagrant fashion into the proceedings of a state board. You will note that the letter contains conclusory and unsupportable statements. For example, the letter states the corporation did not do anything wrong, rather it was its president, as though a corporation could act other than through its officers.

At a public meeting attended by Bally's attorneys I expressed my opinion about the questionable conduct of the United States Attorney's office in writing such a letter. At very least we had the obligation to hear sworn testimony in support of the conclusions if the government's attorneys wanted to give their views. They declined an invitation to testify, and when we issued subpoenas to them they predictably invoked executive privilege and refused to testify. Bally's attorneys then decided to "withdraw" the letter from the three assistant United States attorneys as though they somehow expected

that the Board members were supposed to ignore what had already been presented.

It was on January 26, 1995 that the United States Attorney's office wrote to us telling us that they would not agree to testify before the Board. On January 27, 1995 one of the same assistant United States attorneys who wrote the letter issued a subpoena for all of the Board members to appear before the United States Grand Jury on January 31, 1995. The Board is scheduled to vote on the Bally appeal the next day, February 1, 1995. A copy of the subpoena is attached.

As I am sure you are aware a federal grand jury subpoena can be disconcerting under the best of circumstances. However, just before issuing the subpoena to the Board members the United States Attorney's Office had already gotten the President of LEDGC, Mr. Whitmore, before the Federal Grand Jury and grilled him in a most antagonistic manner. They made it very plain to him that they disagreed with his assessment of Bally's activities. It was clearly not a session designed to secure information, but rather to challenge Mr. Whitmore's conclusions.

Through my attorney, Julian Murray, I expressed to Mr. Letten how ill timed and intimidating were such subpoenas. I inquired as to whether the grand jury appearances could be postponed for a reasonable amount of time so that the Board members did not have to vote on such an important matter knowing that they would incur the ire of the federal prosecutors before whom they would have to appear the next day. Mr. Letten responded to my attorney that a continuance was not possible. Rather, he, Mr. Irwin and Mr. Perricone (the same three Assistant United States Attorneys that sent the letter) felt that it was imperative that the grand jury hearing go forward. When a meeting was requested with United States Attorney Eddie Jordan so that that decision could be reviewed, Mr. Letten responded that the United States Attorney had recused himself in the matter and that he, Letten, was the United States Attorney as far as this particular matter was concerned.

I am therefore required to write to you for review of this decision. I request that there be a postponement of my appearance before the federal grand jury and that when I do appear that the proceedings be handled by a special assistant United States attorney appointed by you.

In closing I emphasize that I write this letter as an individual Board member and do not purport to speak for the Board as a whole or any of the other members. However, I can state to you without equivocation that the interference by the United States Attorney in the Board's proceedings has had a chilling effect on its deliberation. I suggest that if you will take the time which I am requesting to check into this matter you will find that there is not in fact any urgency that would dictate against my request for a reasonable postponement of the grand jury appearance. If there is ever any information which I am able to provide to the United States government I am perfectly willing to do so. I simply request that the inquiry be conducted in an appropriate manner by prosecutors who do not have what is, at very least, the appearance of ulterior motives.

Thanking you for your prompt attention to this matter and awaiting your reply, I remain,

Very truly yours,

FRED J. CASSIBRY,
U.S. District Judge, (Ret.)
Board Member, LEDGC.

[From the Advocate, Baton Rouge, LA., Jan 31, 1995]

FEDS SHOULD EXPLAIN PROSECUTORS' ACTIONS

Appearances can sometimes be deceiving, but it certainly appears as if federal prosecutors are attempting to influence a decision by the state casino board.

We question whether interference in the affairs of the casino board is the proper role for the federal prosecutors and think a public explanation is in order.

At issue is a casino board decision on the issue of whether Bally Gaming Inc. should be issued a license to supply to the New Orleans casino \$6.2 million in slot machines and the computer software to control the machines.

Wilmore Whitmore, chief executive officer of the casino regulatory agency, earlier this month had banned Bally from doing business with Harrah's Jazz Co. Whitmore cited Bally's involvement in the Louisiana video poker industry with two companies named by federal prosecutors as organized crime fronts.

Federal prosecutors have said Bally was the victim of the alleged scheme by organized crime to make inroads into Louisiana's video poker gambling industry.

Whitmore contended, however, that Bally was negligent in its rush to capitalize on the lucrative video gambling industry in Louisiana and failed to exercise sound business practices.

In the early stages, Bally Gaming advanced thousands of dollars to the two Louisiana companies without meaningful oversight, Whitmore said. This business association "afforded organized crime the opportunity to infiltrate the Louisiana video poker industry."

Whitmore also said Bally directors knew or should have known about a year before federal indictments were returned against 17 individuals that the two companies in which some of the indicted men were involved were linked to criminal elements.

The former president of Bally Gaming, Alan Maiss of Reno, Nev., pleaded guilty earlier this month to two counts of misprision of a felony—having knowledge of crimes being committed but failing to report them to proper authorities—in connection with the case.

Bally appealed Whitmore's denial of a license, and the casino board conducted a hearing last week on that appeal.

During the hearing, new casino board member Fred Cassibry of New Orleans, a former U.S. District Judge, was critical of federal prosecutors for writing letters to the casino board in response to a Bally request. The letters portrayed Bally as a victim in the scheme which led to the indictment of 17 people last May.

"I consider this a serious breach of ethics and law," Cassibry said of the letters. "It is a disgusting and disgraceful attempt to influence this board."

The board instructed Whitmore to invite Assistant U.S. Attorneys Jim Letten, Steven Irwin and Salvador Perricone, along with a state police representative, to testify at the hearings.

After the federal prosecutors offered to speak only with "one or two of the commissioners," the board issued a subpoena for them to testify, Cassibry said Monday. The subpoena was ignored, he said.

Now, the U.S. attorney's office has issued subpoenas to all nine members of the casino board to appear today before a federal grand jury.

The casino board is scheduled to meet Wednesday to consider whether to uphold Whitmore's denial of the license.

Cassibry said the U.S. attorney's office is trying to intimidate the casino board into issuing the license to Bally.

It certainly looks as if Cassibry is correct. If that is the case, it is a highly inappropriate role for federal prosecutors to take.

Based on the information presented during the three-day hearing last week we believe Whitmore was justified in his denial of a license for Bally's to do business with the New Orleans casino. Bally's failure to exercise due diligence in regards to its associations certainly seems to be sufficient cause to believe that Louisiana is better off without further association with the firm.

Louisiana has enough mud on its face already for its inept regulation of gambling without adding more by waffling on a license for a firm which allowed the tentacles of organized crime to reach into video poker gambling in the state.

Cassibry said the federal prosecutors became involved because they want Bally to be clean so they can portray the firm as the victim.

"If Bally is the victim, they can stick it to all of those people they are trying to convict . . . That's the only reason I can think of for this outlandish behavior," he said.

We appreciate the federal prosecutors for their role in bringing to light the efforts by organized crime families in New Orleans, New York and New Jersey to become involved in Louisiana's gambling business.

But we don't believe the involvement of the prosecutors in attempting to take up for Bally now is appropriate.

The actions of the federal prosecutors are sufficiently serious that they deserve the attention of—and an explanation by—Attorney General Janet Reno.

[From the Times-Picayune, Feb. 3, 1995]

WRONG DECISION, WRONG MESSAGE

By granting Bally Gaming Inc. a license to sell \$6.2 million worth of slot machines and computer equipment to the temporary casino, the state Casino Board this week reinforced the notion that Louisiana's gambling regulators are more concerned with protecting the powerful casino interests than the integrity of the industry in our state.

Bally Gaming made a terrible business decision when it picked Worldwide Gaming as its exclusive Louisiana distributor for Bally video poker machines three years ago. As this newspaper reported in our December series, "Stacking the Deck: The Birth of Louisiana Gambling," in less than a year, Worldwide had squandered \$13 billion Bally had lent it and was in bankruptcy.

And that was the good news.

A year later, 17 people associated with Worldwide were indicted by the federal government on charges that they operated Worldwide as a front company for organized crime. All but Stephen Bolson, a co-founder of Worldwide, pleaded innocent and await trial.

Enter now the U.S. attorney's office in New Orleans, which wrote a letter for Bally responding to the Casino Board's concerns and claiming the company was an innocent victim in the Worldwide affair.

The office's view that Bally was an innocent victim in the Worldwide scheme was already clear from court documents they filed in the case. Writing a letter on behalf of Bally can only create the impression that the federal government was weighing in on Bally's side in a regulatory dispute where the U.S. attorney has no role.

Whether a company is completely innocent of criminal wrongdoing in its business dealings is an entirely different matter from whether a company is suitable to receive a gambling license.

In fact, there is much in the record of Worldwide's bankruptcy and in court documents and depositions taken in the case to raise serious questions about Bally's suitability to do business in Louisiana's gambling industry.

Here are a few of the details that raise legitimate unanswered questions about Bally Gaming.

Jerry Flynn, Bally Gaming sales manager in 1992, testified in a court deposition that then-Bally president Alan Maiss knew of Worldwide's ties to alleged mobsters but continued to do business with the company. Maiss denies the allegation.

In a plea agreement with the federal government, Mr. Maiss earlier this month pleaded guilty to a felony count of failing to report that one of Worldwide's founders, Christopher Tanfield, did not have a Louisiana gambling license.

Mr. Tanfield, one of the people indicted in the Worldwide case, testified last week in a deposition for the Casino Board that his agreement to resign from Worldwide in 1992 after a newspaper article linked him to members of a New York organized crime family was essentially an artifice—that he continued to work 20-hour days as a "consultant" to Worldwide, taking instructions from Bally officials.

If that is true, it goes to the heart of Casino Board President Wilmore Whitmore's ruling that Bally was unsuitable for a license in part because Bally failed to aggressively address concerns about mob ties in Worldwide's operations.

There is a larger issue at stake here than whether Bally Gaming does or does not have a license.

Under the best of circumstances, a state should do everything in its power to place a gambling license in the hands of operators who are above reproach.

A gambling license is a privilege, not a right. State regulators need not prove that an applicant for a gambling license is unsuitable; the applicant has to prove beyond a reasonable doubt that it is suitable to hold a license.

In deciding to overturn Mr. Whitmore's decision, the gambling board in essence decided that the interests of a casino equipment vendor outweighed the public's right to an untainted gambling industry.

There are many companies across the country that would leap at the chance to supply the casino with equipment—companies whose reputations, judgment and attention to detail are not in question.

By granting Bally a license, the Casino Board has announced what kinds of past behavior it will overlook in its applicants, what kinds of questions it will leave unanswered, what kinds of issues it will overlook.

The board has set the bar at an all-too-familiar low level, and the citizens of the state are ill served by its action.

HONORING THE CESAR CHAVEZ WRITING CONTEST AWARD WINNERS OF THE EAST SIDE UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT

HON. ZOE LOFGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 4, 1995

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the winners of the first annual Cesar Chavez writing contest held by the East Side Union High School District in San Jose, CA. I had the great privilege of attending the award ceremony honoring the student winners on

March 31, 1995, which, as you know, marks the birthday of the late Cesar Chavez. I would like to especially thank Joe Coto, superintendent of the East Side Union High School District, for organizing this important event.

I am very proud of all the students who participated in the Cesar Chavez Writing Contest, and would like to congratulate each of them on their achievement. By participating in this writing contest, these students paid tribute to Cesar Chavez, who dedicated his life to the struggle for equal rights and equal opportunity. His work fighting for human beings and fair working and living conditions for farmworkers was an inspiration to those who joined him and those who supported his efforts around the world.

Cesar Chavez will be remembered for his tireless commitment to improve the plight of farmworkers and the poor throughout the United States. And, he will be remembered for the inspiration his heroic efforts gave to so many Americans to work nonviolently for justice in their communities.

These students who participated in this writing contest have been an inspiration to me in my efforts as a recent cosponsor of a resolution that would declare March 31 a Federal holiday in honor of Cesar Chavez. The resolution which is sponsored by Congressman BOB FILNER of San Diego currently has 20 original cosponsors and will be introduced this Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the students who participated in the Cesar Chavez Writing Contest deserve to be recognized individually for the wonderful essays and poems they wrote in his honor.

Rosalinda Gonzalez of Independence High School and Nicole Perez of Mt. Pleasant High School were the two grand prize winners. Each wrote poems about Cesar Chavez's life. Rosalinda Gonzalez' poem is titled "Cesar Chavez" and Nicole Perez' poem is titled "Recollection."

The first place winners are listed as follows: Sabrina Hernandez of Andrew High School who wrote the essay titled "This Spirit We Follow"; Aberin Rodrigo of James Lick High School who wrote the essay titled "Cesar Chavez"; Kathryn White of Oak Grove High School who wrote the essay titled "Making the World a Better Place"; Lisette Muniz of W.C. Overfelt High School who wrote the poem titled "Cesar Chavez"; Ahmed Desai of Piedmont Hills High School who wrote the essay titled "Dedicated to a Dedicator"; Maria Gonzalez of Santa Teresa High School who wrote the poem titled "Battle"; Brenda Reyes of Silver Creek High School who wrote the poem titled "Who is He?"; and Eulala Reynolds of Yerba Buena High School who wrote the poem titled "Cesar Chavez."

The second place winners are listed as follows: Lauren Droira of Andrew Hill High School who wrote the essay titled "Cesar Chavez' Testimony to Modern Society"; Eve Zuniga of Independence High School who wrote the essay titled "Charity"; Troy Arevalo of James Lick High School who wrote the poem titled "Cesar Chavez"; Marie Aloy of Mt. Pleasant High School who wrote an untitled essay; Mark Papellero of W.C. Overfelt High School who wrote the poem titled "The Lives of Workers"; Raymond Ramirez of Piedmont Hills High School who wrote the poem titled "Chavez y La Causa"; Ester Martinez Estrada of Santa Teresa High School who wrote the essay titled "A Hero to the Mexican Community"; and Anthonette Pena of Silver Creek

High School who wrote the essay titled "Cesar Chavez."

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I ask you to join me in recognizing these distinguished students and award recipients from my district, who looked to see Cesar Chavez as a great citizen worthy of respect, praise, and emulation. Mr. Speaker, we all look in our history with respect and love for the men and women who devote their lives to the cause of social and economic justice to all citizens. Cesar Chavez is such a man. His memory will live on through the heart-felt poems and essays of these students. I commend each of these remarkable students for their important contribution to preserving the memory of Cesar Chavez.

Mr. Speaker, over the next several days I will be entering into the RECORD the essays and poems of these students. I will start by sharing with you the poems of the two grand prize winners, Rosalinda Gonzalez of Independence High School, and Nicole Perez of Mt. Pleasant High School. Their poems follow:

Rosalinda Gonzalez of Independence High School.

"CESAR CHAVEZ"

Lying there in death
In a hot room
With only a fan to cool him
A crate-looking casket
I saw him
In the flesh
A great man's death
People in mourning
Over the end of an era
An era in which
I had no part
The marches, boycotts, fasts,
La huelga
I had only heard of them
from my Dad
Assembled for a funeral
March
Was when I understood
It is about people
By the thousands
They came
Men, women, children
Different races, lifestyles, and creeds
Unity
As I marched
I felt it
I was brought back
To the days
My Dad Spoke of
Marching for a cause
Together as one
Now
Is the time
For action
Our generation is
Next in line
Educate and make a
Change
The birth of a new era

Nicole Perez of Mt. Pleasant High School.

"RECOLLECTION"

My eyes looked up at him longingly,
the man my parents often spoke of.
"There he is hija."
"He's the one," the one that helped us.
He shook my fathers hand, with a firm grip,
and a subtle smile.
He was wearing very simple clothes, yes,
a very humble man.
Yet he held a world of power,
in his strong, worn out hand.
I remembered all the things he did,
all the things he did for us.
The strikes, the vigils, his leadership against